



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,698	11/20/2000	Mario L. Cesana	END920000054US1	8471
5409	7590	01/04/2005	EXAMINER	
ARLEN L. OLSEN SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS 3 LEAR JET LANE SUITE 201 LATHAM, NY 12110			BETIT, JACOB F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	
DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/717,698

Applicant(s)

CESANA ET AL.

Examiner

Jacob F. Betit

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-26 and 31-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 12-26 31-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 10-August-2004 claims 1-2, 20-21, and 31 are amended per applicant's request. Claims 1-10, 12-26, 31-36 are presently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-16, 18-26, 31, 33, and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MacPherson (U.S. patent No. 5,858,500).

As to claim 1, MacPherson teaches a security enclosure (see abstract), comprising:

an electronic assembly (see column 4, lines 24-38);

a tamper respondent wrap secured at least partially around the assembly, wherein the tamper respondent wrap comprises a plurality of layers, and wherein a plurality of electrically conductive lines or a plurality of electrically conductive ink traces exist within each layer of the wrap (see column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 29); and

an extension cable electrically connecting the wrap to the assembly (see column 4, lines 43-46).

As to claim 2, MacPherson teaches wherein the electronic assembly comprises a cryptographic processor card adapted to store key codes to encrypt and decrypt information enclosed within the assembly (see column 4, lines 24-38).

As to claim 4, MacPherson teaches wherein the tamper respondent wrap further includes a plurality of bonding pads formed at a first end of the wrap (see column 5, lines 1-7, where “bonding pads” are read on “connectors”).

As to claim 5, MacPherson teaches wherein the tamper respondent wrap further includes a system of resistors within each layer of the wrap (see column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 29).

As to claim 6, MacPherson teaches wherein each layer of the wrap comprises the ink traces, and wherein the system of resistors connect ink traces within each layer of the wrap to the bonding pads (see column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 29, where the “ink traces” are also used as the “system of resistors”).

As to claim 7, MacPherson teaches wherein the extension cable further includes a plurality of interconnections at a first end of the extension cable (see figure 1, reference number 30, where it is inherent that interconnections are needed to connect the ribbon cable to the monitor).

As to claim 8, MacPherson teaches wherein the extension cable further includes a plurality of bonding pads at a second end of the extension cable (see figure 2, reference number 40).

As to claim 9, MacPherson teaches wherein wires connect the interconnections and the bonding pads of the extension cable (see column 4, lines 62-66).

As to claim 10, MacPherson teaches wherein a plurality of bonding pads on the wrap are bonded to a plurality of bonding pads on the extension cable (see column 5, lines 1-7).

As to claim 12, MacPherson teaches wherein the wrap at least partially covers the extension cable (see figure 2).

As to claim 13, MacPherson teaches wherein the extension cable comprises a flexible dielectric material (see column 4, line 63 through column 5, line 7).

As to claim 14, MacPherson teaches a security enclosure (see abstract), comprising:
an electronic assembly (see column 4, lines 24-38);
an extension, having a first end inserted in the assembly, and a second end having at least one bonding pad thereon (see column 4, lines 43-46); and

Art Unit: 2164

a tamper respondent wrap at least partially surrounding the assembly, having at least one corresponding bonding pad, wherein the bonding pad of the extension is secured to the bonding pad of the wrap, wherein the tamper respondent wrap comprises a plurality of layers, and wherein each layer of the wrap includes a plurality of electrically conductive lines or a plurality of electrically conductive ink traces (see column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 29, where “at least on corresponding bonding pad” is read on “connectors”).

As to claim 15, MacPherson teaches wherein the first end of the extension comprises at least one interconnection which forms an electrical connection between the assembly and the extension (see column 4, lines 51 through column 5, line 7).

As to claim 16, MacPherson teaches wherein the at least one interconnection is electrically connected to the at least one bonding pad of the extension via a wire (see column 4, lines 51 through column 5, line 7).

As to claim 18, MacPherson teaches wherein the wrap further includes a system of resistors connecting ink traces within the wrap to the bonding pads of the wrap (see column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 29, where the “ink traces” are also used as the “system of resistors”).

As to claim 19, MacPherson teaches wherein the extension comprises a flexible cable (see column 4, line 63 through column 5, line 7).

As to claim 20, MacPherson teaches a security enclosure (see abstract), comprising:
an electronic assembly (see column 4, lines 24-38); and
a tamper respondent wrap electrically connected to the assembly via an attachable extension, wherein the tamper respondent wrap comprises a plurality of layers, and wherein a plurality of electrically conductive lines or a plurality of electrically conductive ink traces exist within each layer of the wrap (see column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 29).

As to claim 21, MacPherson teaches a security enclosure, comprising:
an electronic assembly (see column 4, lines 24-38); and
a tamper respondent wrap electrically connected to the assembly via an attachable extension, wherein the attachable extension comprises a flexible extension cable, and wherein an end of the flexible cable has a bonding pad thereon (see column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 29).

As to claim 22, MacPherson teaches wherein the tamper respondent wrap comprises a plurality of bonding pads formed on an end thereof (see column 5, lines 1-7, where “bonding pads” are read on “connectors”).

As to claim 23, MacPherson teaches wherein the extension comprises a plurality of bonding pads formed on a first end thereof (see figure 2, reference number 40).

Art Unit: 2164

As to claim 24, MacPherson teaches wherein the bonding pads of the wrap are secured to the bonding pads of the extension (see column 5, lines 1-7).

As to claim 25, MacPherson teaches wherein the extension further comprises a plurality of interconnections formed at a second end of the extension (see column 4, lines 62-66).

As to claim 26, MacPherson teaches wherein a system of resistors electrically connects the bonding pads of the wrap to ink traces of the wrap (see column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 7, where the “ink traces” are also used as the “system of resistors”).

As to claim 31, MacPherson teaches a method of forming a security enclosure (see abstract), comprising:

providing an electronic assembly having an opening therein (see figure 1, reference number 45);

inserting a first end of an extension within the opening of the assembly (see column 5, lines 1-7);

wrapping a tamper respondent wrap at least partially around the assembly, wherein the tamper respondent wrap comprises a plurality of layers and wherein a plurality of electrically conductive lines or a plurality of electrically conductive ink traces exist within each layer of the wrap (see column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 29); and

electrically connecting a second end of the extension to the wrap (see column 5, lines 1-7).

As to claim 33, MacPherson teaches wherein the extension comprises a flexible cable (see column 4, line 63 through column 5, line 7).

As to claim 35, MacPherson teaches wherein each layer of the wrap comprises the electrically conductive lines, and wherein the electrically conductive lines include an electrically conductive thermoplastic polymer (see column 4, lines 51-67, where “thermoplastic polymer” is read on “polyester ink”).

As to claim 36, MacPherson teaches wherein each layer of the wrap comprises the electrically conductive lines, and wherein the electrically conductive lines include an electrically conductive thermoset polymer (see column 4, lines 51-67, where “thermoplastic polymer” is read on “polyester ink”).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 17, 32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacPherson (U.S. patent No. 5,858,500) in view of Burton (U.S. patent No. 6,084,380).

Art Unit: 2164

As to claim 3, MacPherson teaches a security enclosure (see abstract), comprising:
an electronic assembly (see column 4, lines 24-38);
a tamper respondent wrap secured at least partially around the assembly (see column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 29).

MacPherson does not teach wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly.

Burton teaches a planar intelligent battery lable for the exterior surface of a standard battery pack (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly (see column 10, lines 1-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified MacPherson to include wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified MacPherson by the teachings of Burton because wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly would retain the folded overlapping portions in place and would conceal the lines (see MacPherson, column 5, lines 33-40).

As to claim 17, MacPherson does not teach wherein the wrap further includes an adhesive on an inner surface of the wrap to secure the wrap to the assembly.

Burton teaches wherein the wrap further includes an adhesive on an inner surface of the wrap to secure the wrap to the assembly (see column 10, lines 1-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified MacPherson to include wherein the wrap further includes an adhesive on an inner surface of the wrap to secure the wrap to the assembly.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified MacPherson by the teachings of Burton because wherein the wrap further includes an adhesive on an inner surface of the wrap to secure the wrap to the assembly would retain the folded overlapping portions in place and would conceal the lines (see MacPherson, column 5, lines 33-40).

As to claim 32, MacPherson does not teach wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly.

Burton teaches wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly (see column 10, lines 1-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified MacPherson to include wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified MacPherson by the teachings of Burton because wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the

Art Unit: 2164

electronic assembly would retain the folded overlapping portions in place and would conceal the lines (see MacPherson, column 5, lines 33-40).

As to claim 34, MacPherson does not teach wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly.

Burton teaches wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly (see column 10, lines 1-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified MacPherson to include wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified MacPherson by the teachings of Burton because wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly would retain the folded overlapping portions in place and would conceal the lines (see MacPherson, column 5, lines 33-40).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 10- August-2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "MacPherson does not teach 'wherein a plurality of electrically conductive lines or a plurality of electrically conductive ink traces exist within each layer of the wrap'", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive because the claim limitation says "within" not "in". Once the lines are printed on the wrap they are "within" the wrap because they inside the limits of the wrap.

Further it is noted that in the disclosed specification the applicant states "The cloth 120, such as disclosed in the patent to MacPherson (US 5,858,500), is a sheet of composite material comprising a laminate formed of a number of separate layers, including a delimitation respondent layer, and a pierco and laser respondent layer" (see the paragraph that begins on page 7, line 8). From this disclosure it seems the applicant is admitting that MacPherson already discloses the wrap used in the present invention.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "MacPherson does not teach the existence of a bonding pad", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive because it is not clear how the phrase "bonding pad" differs from the "connectors" disclosed by MacPherson. They both are used to describe an area of the extension used to hold connections between the assembly and the wrap.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "the Examiner's argument for modifying MacPherson with the teaching of Burton is not persuasive", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive because although MacPherson uses an adhesive that is not necessarily located on the inner surface of the wrap, the introduction of Burton shows that

Art Unit: 2164

this is simply a design choice that would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. MacPherson states that adhesive is provided and does not disclose how much or exactly where the adhesive is placed. Burton shows that it is well known in the art that adhesive can be placed on this type of circuit in order to secure it to an assembly.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Betit whose telephone number is (571) 272-4075. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9 am to 5 pm.

Art Unit: 2164

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (571) 272-4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jfb
15 Dec 2004



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER